

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/681,851	10/08/2003	Jerome D. Brown	10386US01	7145		
75	90 05/16/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
Imat incorp.			RIVERA, WIL	RIVERA, WILLIAM ARAUZ		
PO Box 64898 St. Paul, MN	55164-0898	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			3654			
			DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/681,85	51	BROWN ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		William A.	Rivera	3654				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicati r Reply	ion appears on the	cover sheet with th	ne correspondence ad	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutore to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF TH CFR 1.136(a). In no evolation. y period will apply and w by statute, cause the app	IIS COMMUNICAT ent, however, may a reply b II expire SIX (6) MONTHS t lication to become ABANDO	ION.  re timely filed  from the mailing date of this of the control of the contro				
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n						
·	·	·· ☑ This action is n	on-final					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to					e merits is			
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims			•				
· <u> </u>								
•	4) Claim(s) 1-14 and 26-44 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-8,12,13,32-34 and 36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
	6)  Claim(s) <u>1,9,10,14,26-29,31,35,37-39,41, 43, and 44</u> is/are rejected.							
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction		equirement.					
. — Applicati	on Papers							
	•	ominor.						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f	oreian priority un	der 35 II S.C. & 119	9(a)-(d) or (f)				
-	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	oreign priority and	201 00 0.0.0. 3 110	o(a)-(a) or (i).				
۵٫۱	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachment	r(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summ					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-S nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO	•	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform	il Date al Patent Application (PT)	O-152)			
	No(s)/Mail Date	,	6) Other:		·			

Application/Control Number: 10/681,851 Page 2

Art Unit: 3654

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Species III (Figure 5), Claims 1, 9-11, 14, 26-31, 35, and 36 in the reply filed on February 25, 2005 is acknowledged. Claims 2-8, 12-13, 15-25, 32-34 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on February 25, 2005.

Claim 36 will also be withdrawn because of the reasons set forth in under the 35 USC § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph set forth below and because the chosen species, which is a hub with no tape wound on it, does not read on claim 36 which requires a tape to be wound on a hub.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 1, 9-11, 14, 35, and 37-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 35, and 37 are vague and indefinite. With respect to claims 1, 35, and 37, it is unclear as to what structure is being defined by a tape winding surface having an effective radial modulus. What properties of the winding surface are being claimed? What happens when there is no applied stress? Note that when there is no radial stress being applied, i.e., when no tape is wound then the stress is zero, therefore the modulus is zero according to claim 1, lines 6-8.

Thus, how is the structure of the winding surface changed by winding the tape thereon?

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/681,851

Art Unit: 3654

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 9-10, 14, 26-29, 31, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Weyrich et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,485,456).

With respect to Claims 1, 9-10, 14, 26-29, 31, 35, 37-39, 41, 43, and 44, Weyrich et al, Figures 1-3, teaches a tape reel assembly comprising: a hub 12 defining an inner surface opposite a tape winding surface, at least a portion of the hub being made of plastic; wherein the tape winding surface has an effective radial modulus of greater than 0.3 million pounds-per-square-inch.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Weyrich et al would meet each of the limitations because the metal insert 26 provides reinforcement for the plastic hub thereby creating a highly rigid, and sturdy reel construction.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 9-10, 14, 26-29, 31, 35, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Weyrich et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,485,456).

With respect to Claim 1, the admitted prior art, Page 10, lines 20-22, teaches a hub having an effective radial modulus of 0.19 Msi. Weyrich et al, Figures 1-3, teaches a plastic hub

Art Unit: 3654

and a metal insert 26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the plastic hub of the admitted prior art with a metal insert, as taught by Weyrich et al, for the purpose of increasing the strength of the hub thereby increasing the effective radial modulus.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11, 30, 40, and 42 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's remarks on page 8 regarding claim 36, the claim will remain withdrawn because of the reasons set forth under 35 USC § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph section.

With respect to applicant's remarks regarding Weyrich et al and the core, it should be noted that the combination of all of elements 20, 22, and 26 constitute a "solid" core. Further, it is the examiners position that effective radial modulus is met by the addition of element 26 of the Weyrich et al reference. The definition of the term "effective radial modulus" set forth in, e.g., claim 1, lines 6-8, does not serve to structurally differentiate between the instant invention and the prior art.

With respect to applicant's remarks regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection, the examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. However, there is no requirement that a motivation to

Application/Control Number: 10/681,851

Art Unit: 3654

make the modification be expressly articulated in the primary reference. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would have fairly suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. Further, with respect to applicant's remarks on pages 13-14 regarding expansion and contraction, the examiner is not aware of any known substance which does not expand or contract due to heating or cooling.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William A. Rivera whose telephone number is 571-272-6953. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday - 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/681,851 Page 6

Art Unit: 3654

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on 571-272-6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WILLIAM A. RIVERA PRIMARY EXAMINER

May 15, 2006